

At the same time, Babbitt said he had no recollection of the campaign contributions remarks Eckstein said he made:

Q: Now, I believe some of the questions from the senators were, at least, driving towards what can you remember because you know it did not happen versus what are you allowing the possibility of.

And is it fair to say that you're leaving open the possibility that you said it because you just can't say with certainty that you didn't make this contributions remark?

A: Yes, slightly. Yeah, I guess I could parse that either way. I guess – I think that's a fair question, and I think that's a correct answer. I have no recollection of that.

But in terms of the Ickes thing, I'm pretty clear about what I didn't say, as we've discussed.

On this one, I think it's conceivable that that could have been a topic.

Now, as I recall, Eckstein says this came out of his reference to the O'Connor letter, it followed in that sequence. I have no recollection. I've thought about this, and I've thought, you know, what is the sequence, how it might flow out of the O'Connor letter and it doesn't help.

But is it conceivable? As I read his version, I think it is conceivable for this reason: his version of this, he doesn't seem to recall exactly what was said and he, as I remember his version, says, I'm not sure whether it was about these Indians, Indians with casinos or Indians, in general.

---

<sup>709</sup>(...continued)

A: I think it's very possible. You know, I think the important thing to remember is that people carry different perceptions away from conversations and it's entirely possible that there are failures of perception on both sides, one or the other.

*Id.* at 121.